UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/992,109	11/06/2001	Andrew Divaker ShamRao		7475

7590 03/10/2004

Andrew Divaker ShamRao
2901 S. Michigan Ave. #905
Chicago, IL 60616

EXAMINER	
LU, KUEN S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/992,109	SHAMRAO, ANDREW DIVAKER	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kuen S Lu	2177	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 November 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-4 and 19-20 are rejected are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ballantyne et al. (U.S. Patent 5,867,821, hereafter "Ballantyne") and in view of Stone III et al. (U.S. Patent 5,630,174, hereafter "Stone")

As per claim 1, Ballantyne teaches the following:

"A handheld device" at Fig. 1, element 10, by showing the PDA, comprising:

"removable, replaceable, and upgradeable modules including a removable, replaceable, upgradeable, and re-writeable Personal Universal Memory card capable of receiving and storing information associated with a user from a server" at col. 10, lines 58-67, col. 11, lines 8-9, col. 12, lines 35-37 and col. 14, lines 13-19 by reading/writing the health card, utilizing standardized PCMCIA card slots, updating health card and inserting the health card.

Ballantyne does not specifically teach "a motherboard having sockets to accept the replaceable, and upgradeable modules", though Ballantyne teaches PCMCIA slot for health card at Fig. 6 and col. 14, lines 13-15.

However, Stone teaches a motherboard having PCMCIA adapter sockets at Fig. 2, elements 200 and 212-218.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Stone's reference with Ballantyne's teaching by designing PCMCIA slots docketed on the motherboard because by doing so the communication of the PCMCIA channels would bypass the host system for efficient peripheral i/o and cpu performance.

As per claim 2, Ballantyne teaches "Personal Universal Memory card is used as an identification card for interaction with a device that requires user information" at col. 10, 65-67 and col. 11, lines 2-4 where health card maintain information for each patient and the uniqueness of patient's health card.

As per claim 3, Ballantyne teaches "the Personal Universal Memory card is used to customize a device to the needs of the consumer" at col. 10, lines 58-67 by using the health card to maintain each patient's information in digital compressed information.

As per claim 4, Ballantyne teaches "Personal Universal Memory card is credit-card-sized" at col. 10, lines 64-67 by utilizing standardized PCMCIA car slots for health cards.

As per claim 19, Ballantyne teaches the following:

"a computer program product for implementing, in a handheld device wirelessly coupled with a server, a method of initiating a user session with the server from the handheld device, the computer program product" at Fig. 1 and the abstract;

"a computer-readable medium carrying executable instructions that, when executed,

are capable of performing the acts of: identifying the presence of a Personal Universal Memory card in the handheld device" at col. 11, lines 2-4 by identifying patient through the uniqueness of the health card; "requesting initiation of a user session after the user has been verified as being the owner of the Personal Universal Memory card in the device" at col. 11, lines 5-11 by registering patient through initialization session; and "receiving and storing, at the handheld device, configuration information that the handheld device allows to be downloaded to it" at col. 11, line 2-4 and 12, lines 37-41 by transferring update information of patient's record to the appropriate work station by tracking the location of the patient.

As per claim 20, Ballantyne teaches the executable instructions, when executed, are further capable of performing the act of sending, from the handheld device, coded preference information associated with the user to the server, the coded preference information having been generated in a process at the handheld device at Fig. 1 by showing the architecture of server, workstation and hand-held device for performing and distributing the medical services;

"of performing the act of receiving, at the server, coded preference information sent by the handheld device, and using the coded preference information to access a database maintained at the server system in order to locate the data with codes that match the coded preference information associated with the user" at col. 13, lines 43-50; and "the handheld device downloading the configuration information to the handheld device" at col. 11, line 2-4 and 12, lines 37-41 by transferring update information of patient's record to the appropriate work station by tracking the location of the patient.

2. Claims 5-8 are rejected are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ballantyne et al. (U.S. Patent 5,867,821, hereafter "Ballantyne") and in view of Stone III et al. (U.S. Patent 5,630,174, hereafter "Stone"), as applied to claims 1-4, and further in view of Tolopka (U.S. Patent 6,044,349, hereafter "Tolopka").

As per claim 5, the combined Stone-Ballantyne reference teaches a hand-held device wit socket for smart card.

The combined reference does not specifically teach "Personal Universal Memory card is used as a credit card, debit card, or ATM card", though Ballantyne teaches health card utilizing smart card technology at col. 10, lines 58-59.

However, Tolopka teaches utilizing smart card for financial and medical usage at col. 1, lines 28-31 and 46-51.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Tolopka and Stone's references with Ballantyne's teaching by enabling health card with financial transaction capability because by doing so the health card would have been one-for-all purposes smart card such that consumers would not have to acquire a plurality of cards.

As per claim 6, Tolopka further teaches "the Personal Universal Memory card contains a cryptographic key" at col. 1, lines 53-60 by using encrypted security information on the smart card.

As per claim 7, Tolopka further teaches "the cryptographic key protects the user's privacy during use" at col. 1, lines 53-60 and col. 3, lines 36-42 by using encrypted security password and encrypted personal identification on the smart card.

As per claim 8, Tolopka further teaches "wherein the cryptographic key is used to securely store the user's biometric scan on the Personal Universal Memory card for later comparison against user scans conducted for activating a user-session or for conducting transactions" at col. 3, lines 36-42 by using encrypted personal identification and/or biometric code stored on the smart card.

3. Claims 17-18 are rejected are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ballantyne et al. (U.S. Patent 5,867,821, hereafter "Ballantyne") and in view of Stone III et al. (U.S. Patent 5,630,174, hereafter "Stone"), and further in view of Tolopka (U.S. Patent 6,044,349, hereafter "Tolopka").

As per claim 17, Ballantyne teaches "computer network that includes a server wirelessly communicating with one or more wireless handheld devices, a method of permitting a particular user to access the computer network from any of the handheld devices" at Fig. 1, elements 6, the nursing station as the server and element 10 the hand-held device communicating with the server through PCS wirelessly as shown in Fig. 6, elements 100 and 102 and at col. 4, lines 65-67 by communicating servers on the computer network.

Ballantyne teaches the following:

"requiring that a Personal Universal Memory card be inserted into the device, requiring" the user's information matches the "information stored on the Personal Universal Memory card, and maintaining at the server unique customer identifiers associated with users" at Fig. 6, elements "Health Card" and PCS, and col. 10, line 58 - col. 11,line 11 by describing reading and writing health card by matching uniqueness of the patient.

Ballantyne does not specifically teach the biometric information to identify the users.

However, Tolopka teaches "wherein the cryptographic key is used to securely store the user's biometric scan on the Personal Universal Memory card for later comparison against user scans conducted for activating a user-session or for conducting transactions" at col. 3, lines 36-42 by using encrypted personal identification and/or biometric code stored on the smart card.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Tolopka and Stone's references with Ballantyne's teaching by enabling health card with biometric information for identifying user because by doing so the health card would have been the one only for all purposes smart card with high security of protection such that consumers need to carry would not have to acquire a plurality of cards.

Tolopka further teaches "maintaining at the servers unique identifiers associated with a plurality of users of the computer network and establishing the user session without regard to any specific handheld device" at col. 1, lines 53-60 and col. 3, lines 36-42 by using encrypted security password and encrypted personal identification on the smart card.

As per claim 18, Ballantyne teaches "at the server, using coded user preferences sent by the handheld device to the server to locate user-preferred data with matching codes" at col. 10, line 65 – col. 11, line 11 by describing reading and writing health card by matching uniqueness of the patient; and "downloading that data from the server to the selected handheld device based on the device hardware configuration" at col. 11, line 2-4

and 12, lines 37-41 by transferring update information of patient's record to the appropriate work station by tracking the location of the patient.

4. Claim 9 is rejected are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ballantyne et al. (U.S. Patent 5,867,821, hereafter "Ballantyne") and in view of Stone III et al. (U.S. Patent 5,630,174, hereafter "Stone"), as applied to claims 1-4, and further in view of Chuang (U.S. Patent 5,551,012, hereafter "Chuang").

As per claim 9, the combined Stone-Ballantyne reference teaches a hand-held device wit socket for smart card.

The combined reference does not specifically teach "wherein the motherboard has a central processing unit (CPU) socket to accept the removable, replaceable, and upgradeable central processing unit".

However, Chuang teaches motherboard having sockets for removable, replaceable, and upgradeable central processing units at col. 2, lines 34-44.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Chuang and Stone's references with Ballantyne's by designing the motherboard of the hand-held device with flexibility of removing, replacing and upgrading the central processor units because by doing so the computer system could have bad parts replaced and would have a longer life.

5. Claims 10-16 are rejected are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ballantyne et al. (U.S. Patent 5,867,821, hereafter "Ballantyne") and in view of Stone III et al. (U.S. Patent 5,630,174, hereafter "Stone"), as applied to claims 1-4, and further in view of Nguyen (U.S. Patent 6,401,157, hereafter "Nguyen").

As per claim 10, the combined Stone-Ballantyne reference teaches a hand-held device wit socket for smart card.

The combined reference does not specifically teach "wherein the motherboard has a Random Access Memory socket to accept the removable, replaceable, and upgradeable Random Access Memory module".

However, Nguyen teaches motherboard having sockets for removable, replaceable, and upgradeable random access memory chips at col. 5, lines 48-60.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Nguyen and Stone's references with Ballantyne's by designing the motherboard of the hand-held device with flexibility of removing, replacing and upgrading the random access memory chips because by doing so the computer system could have bad parts replaced and would have a longer life.

As per claim 11, Nguyen further teaches "wherein the motherboard has a Read Only Memory socket to accept the removable, replaceable, and upgradeable Read Only Memory module" at col. 5, lines 33-41.

As per claim 12, the combined Stone-Ballantyne reference teaches a hand-held device wit socket for smart card.

The combined reference does not specifically teach "wherein the motherboard has a sound module socket, further comprising a removable, replaceable, and upgradeable sound module adapted to be plugged into the sound module socket" though Ballantyne teaches voice entry to the hand-held device at Fig. 6, element "Voice Entry".

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention was made to combine Nguyen and Stone's references with Ballantyne's by designing the motherboard of the hand-held device with flexibility of removing, replacing and upgrading the sound module socket because by doing so the computer system could have bad parts replaced and would have a longer life.

As per claim 13, Nguyen further teaches "wherein the motherboard has a graphics module socket, further comprising a removable, replaceable, and upgradeable graphics module adapted to be plugged into the graphics module socket" at col. 5, lines 7-13.

As per claim 14, the combined Stone-Ballantyne reference teaches a hand-held device wit socket for smart card.

The combined reference does not specifically teach "wherein the motherboard has a wireless module socket, further comprising a removable, replaceable, and upgradeable wireless module adapted to be plugged into the wireless module socket" though Ballantyne teaches wireless/IR communication to the hand-held device at Fig. 6, element 102.

However, Nguyen teaches hot-plug sockets for interface components to the motherboard at col. 3, lines 1-7.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Nguyen and Stone's references with Ballantyne's by designing the motherboard of the hand-held device with flexibility of removing, replacing and upgrading the wireless module socket because by doing so the computer system could have bad parts replaced and would have a longer life.

As per claim 15, the combined Stone-Ballantyne reference teaches a hand-held device wit socket for smart card.

The combined reference does not specifically teach "wherein the motherboard has a biometric scanner socket, further comprising a removable, replaceable, and upgradeable biometric scanner adapted to be plugged into the biometric scanner socket" though Ballantyne teaches health card interface to the hand-held device at Fig. 6.

However, Nguyen teaches hot-plug sockets for interface components to the motherboard at col. 3, lines 1-7.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Nguyen and Stone's references with Ballantyne's by designing the motherboard of the hand-held device with flexibility of removing, replacing and upgrading the biometric scanner socket because by doing so the computer system could have bad parts replaced and would have a longer life.

As per claim 16, the combined Stone-Ballantyne reference teaches a hand-held device wit socket for smart card.

The combined reference does not specifically teach "a card-reader slot to accept the removable, replaceable, re-writeable, and upgradeable Personal Universal Memory card" though Ballantyne teaches health card interface for accepting the removable, replaceable, re-writeable, and upgradeable health card.

However, Nguyen teaches hot-plug sockets for interface components to the motherboard at col. 3, lines 1-7.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention was made to combine Nguyen and Stone's references with Ballantyne's by designing the motherboard of the hand-held device with flexibility of removing, replacing and upgrading the card-reader slot because by doing so the computer system could have bad parts replaced and would have a longer life.

Conclusions

6. The prior art made of record

A. U.S. Patent 5,867,821

B. U.S. Patent 5,630,174

C. U.S. Patent 5,551,012

D. U.S. Patent 6,401,157

E. U.S. Patent 6,044,349

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. F. U.S. Patent 6,601,172

U. U.S. Publication 2002/0052843

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuen S Lu whose telephone number is 703-305-4894. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM, Monday through Friday.
If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.
Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Kuen S. Lu

Patent Examiner

March 8, 2004

GRETA ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER